

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Amber Widby v. County of Los Angeles, Eli Vera, Angela Carrasco,
and Does 1-20, inclusive

Widby · No. 2:25-cv-05648 DMG (JCx) · Decided January 16, 2026

SUMMARY

This document is a court-approved stipulated protective order in a federal civil rights action against the County of Los Angeles and individual defendants. It governs the designation, disclosure, use, challenge, filing under seal, return, and destruction of confidential discovery materials, including law-enforcement, correctional, medical, and personal information.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jacqueline Chooljian
DECIDED	January 16, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-05648 DMG (JCx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties stipulated to entry of a protective order governing confidential discovery material in this civil-rights action. The court entered the order as modified.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Amber Widby v. County of Los Angeles, Eli Vera, Angela Carrasco, Does 1-20, inclusive

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- medical records privacy
- civil procedure
- civil rights
- municipal liability

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- health law
- municipal law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause supported entry of a stipulated protective order governing confidential discovery material.
2. What procedures and standards must govern designating, using, challenging, filing, and disposing of protected material.
3. Whether the protective order could permit filing confidential material under seal without a separate court order and the required showing under applicable sealing rules.

HOLDINGS

1. Good cause supported entry of a protective order limiting disclosure and use of qualifying confidential discovery material in the litigation.
2. Confidentiality designations must be limited to material that qualifies for protection; blanket, mass, indiscriminate, or tactical designations are not permitted.
3. The protective order does not itself authorize filing confidential material under seal; a party must comply with Local Rule 79-5 and obtain a court order supported by the applicable good-cause or compelling-reasons showing.
4. A party or nonparty may challenge a confidentiality designation through the procedures specified in the order, and the designating party bears the burden of persuasion unless the designation is withdrawn or waived.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“There is a strong presumption that the public has a right of access to judicial proceedings and records in civil cases.” (at 2)

“The parties’ mere designation of Disclosure or Discovery Material as CONFIDENTIAL does not—without the submission of competent evidence by declaration, establishing that the material sought to be filed under seal qualifies as confidential, privileged, or otherwise protectable—constitute good cause.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action concerns events at Plaintiff’s residence in 2024, followed by her arrest, detention, medical treatment, housing at the Century Regional Detention Facility, and transfers to other facilities. Discovery is expected to include body-worn-camera recordings, dispatch and incident reports, operational details concerning Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department responses, protective sweeps, probation information, jail-security materials, and personal health and medication records. The parties sought confidentiality protections for information involving Plaintiff, witnesses, third parties, medical personnel, and detainees.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff brought a civil-rights action alleging, among other claims, unreasonable seizure, unlawful search, civil-rights conspiracy, failure to intervene, deliberate indifference to serious medical needs, and municipal liability. Anticipating discovery involving body-worn-camera footage, law-enforcement records, jail and medical records,

personal information, and security materials, the parties submitted a stipulated protective order. The court found good cause and ordered the protective order entered as modified.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. General Motors Corp., 307 F.3d 1206, 1210-11 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Makar-Welbon v. Sony Electronics, Inc., 187 F.R.D. 576, 577 (E.D. Wis. 1999)
- Pintos v. Pacific Creditors Ass'n, 605 F.3d 665, 677-79 (9th Cir. 2010)